

Appl. No. 10/709,802
Response Dated July 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated April 21, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present application includes claims 1-28. In the current Office Action, claims 1, 10, 14, 21-23, 26, and 28 were rejected, claims 2-9, 11-13, 19, 20, 24, 25, and 27 were objected to as being directed to allowable subject matter but dependent on a rejected base claims, and claims 15-18 were allowed. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 15-18 are allowable and that claims 2-9, 11-13, 19, 20, 24, 25, and 27 are directed to allowable subject matter. In this response, claims 1 and 19-21 are amended and claims 11 and 24 are cancelled. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10, 12-23, and 25-28 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

Page 1 of the specification was objected to because the title of the invention should not appear in brackets, the recitation "Description" should be deleted, and the title of the invention should not appear on the Abstract page. In response, as shown above, the Applicant amends the specification to delete the recitation of "Description" on page 1, to remove the brackets surrounding the title of the invention, and to delete the recitation of the title on the abstract page. In addition, paragraph [0081] is amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter is added.

Appl. No. 10/709,802
Response Dated July 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated April 21, 2006

Objections to the Claims

Claims 19 and 20 were objected to because the recitation "loading device" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 19 and 20 have been amended to correct this informality. No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 102(b)

Claims 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,367,323 issued to Camwell, *et al.* ("Camwell"). The Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 26 is allowable because Camwell does not disclose all of the limitations recited in the claim.

Claim 26 recites "seating a while drilling tool in a pocket in the landing collar." Camwell, which discloses a dynamic pressure device for oil drill systems, does not disclose a while drilling tool that is seated in a pocket on the landing collar. One example of a pocket is shown in FIG. 12 of the present application. The tool (202) is positioned in a pocket (241) in the landing collar (203).

Camwell does not disclose any pocket in the landing collar. In the rejection, the landing sleeve (34) in FIG. 2 of Camwell was likened to the claimed landing collar. While the tool (32) of Camwell is positioned in the bore running through the landing sleeve (34), the tool is not positioned in any pocket in the landing sleeve (34), as required by the claims.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26 and 28 under § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/709,802
Response Dated July 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated April 21, 2006

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 102(e)

Claims 1, 10, 14, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,856,255 issued to Chalitsios, *et al.* ("Chalitsios"). The Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 21, as amended, are allowable because Chalitsios does not disclose all of the limitations recited in the claims. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include limitations from other claims that are directed to allowable subject matter but dependent on a rejected base claims.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations in claim 11, which was indicated to be directed to allowable subject matter but dependent on a rejected base claim. By including the limitations in claim 11, claim 1 is now allowable. Dependent claims 10 and 14 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 21 is amended to include the limitations in claim 24, which has been cancelled. The Examiner indicated that claim 24 was directed to allowable subject matter but dependent on a rejected base claim. By incorporating the limitations of claim 24 into claim 21, claim 21 is allowable over the cited reference. Dependent claims 22 and 23 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 10, 14, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this

Appl. No. 10/709,802
Response Dated July 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated April 21, 2006

application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered or any credits, to Deposit Account 19-0610 (Reference Number 19.0350CIP).

Date: 7/20/06

Respectfully submitted,


James L. Kurka, Reg. No. 47,726
Schlumberger Technology Corporation
200 Gillingham Lane, MD 9
Sugar Land, TX 77478
Telephone: (281) 285-7114
Facsimile: (281) 285-8821